REMARKS

Claims 1-95 are pending, with claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, 36, 43, 50, 57, 64, 71, 78, and 85 being independent. Claims 1, 6, 8, 14, 15, 22, 29, 36, 57, 59, 62, 64, 66, 69, 71, 73, 78, 80, and 85 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found in the originally-filed specification, at least at page 14, line 1 to page 19, line 21 and Figs. 3A-3C. No new matter has been added.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 85-95 recite allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-19, 21-28, and 43-56 have been rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,872,322 (Chow) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,566,270 (Liu) and Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era (Wolf).

With respect to claims 1-5 and 7-13, applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because neither Chow, Liu, Wolf, nor any proper combination of the three describes or suggests performing a first etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, cleaning the chamber including generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue, and performing a second etching in the chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent claims 1 and 8.

With respect to claims 15-19 and 21-28, applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because neither Chow, Liu, Wolf, nor any proper combination of the three describes or suggests performing a first etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, cleaning the chamber including placing a second substrate in the chamber, and then performing a second etching in the cleaned chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent claims 15 and 22.

With respect to claims 43-49, applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because neither Chow, Liu, Wolf, nor any proper combination of the three describes or suggests etching a conductive film in a chamber, cleaning the chamber including placing a second substrate in the

chamber, and then etching the conductive film in the cleaned chamber, as recited in independent claim 43.

With respect to claims 50-56, applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because neither Chow, Liu, Wolf, nor any proper combination of the three describes or suggests etching a conductive film in a chamber, cleaning the chamber including placing a dummy substrate in the chamber, and then etching the conductive film in the cleaned chamber, as recited in independent claim 50.

In Chow, cleaning methods use gases functioning for both etching and cleaning. See Chow at abstract. Chow explains that multiple stages are used to "etch multiple layers on the substrate, and the cleaning gas is introduced in at least one of the stages to remove etchant residue deposited on the chamber surfaces in one or more of the multiple etching steps." See Chow at col. 10, line 35 to col. 11, line 48 and Fig. 3. Thus, in Chow, a single substrate (which forms the semiconductor device) remains in the chamber during the cleaning stage and there is no suggestion that cleaning of the chamber includes placing a dummy or second substrate in the chamber. Additionally, Chow never describes or suggests that the cleaning would include generating plasma from a cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue.

Liu and Wolf do not remedy the failure of Chow to describe or suggest this subject matter. Wolf is silent regarding cleaning of a chamber. Liu's described cleaning process occurs after the only substrate that is mentioned is removed from the chamber prior to cleaning and cleaning does not include placement of a dummy or a second substrate in the chamber. See Liu at abstract and Fig. 3. Also, like Chow, neither Liu nor Wolf mention cleaning that includes generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue.

Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Chow to include the placement of a second or dummy substrate in the chamber for cleaning or to remove BO_x on an inside of the chamber. In particular, Chow explicitly teaches away from such a second or dummy substrate and explains that increased cost is associated with additional

substrates "that results from the downtime of the etching chamber during the dry or wet cleaning and seasoning process steps" (see Chow at col. 2, lines 31-34) and that the "chamber surfaces are cleaned and conditioned by the etchant and cleaning gas combination, without requiring a separate seasoning or conditioning process step (see Chow at col. 11, lines 40-48)." Additionally, Chow never suggests that BO_x would be adhered to an inside of the chamber, and therefore Chow never suggests that cleaning would include removal of such BO_x.

Accordingly, claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 43, and 50 are allowable over any proper combination of Chow, Liu, and Wolf. Claims 2-5, 7, 9-13, 16-19, 21, 23-28, 44-49, and 51-56 are allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 43, and 50 are allowable.

Claims 6, 14, and 20 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Chow in view of Liu, U.S. Patent No. 5,756,400 (Ye), and Wolf. Claims 6, 14, and 20 depend, respectively, from claims 1, 8, and 15, which were rejected as being unpatentable over Chow in view of Liu and Wolf. As discussed above, neither Chow, Liu, Wolf, nor any proper combination of the three describes or suggests performing a first etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, cleaning the chamber including generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue, and then performing a second etching in the chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent claims 1 and 8, or performing a first etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, cleaning the chamber including placing a second substrate in the chamber, and then performing a second etching in the cleaned chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent claim 15.

Ye does not remedy the failure of these references to describe or suggest this subject matter. In Ye, interior surfaces of a plasma processing device can be dry cleaned using an inorganic halogenated gas mixture. See Ye at col. 6, lines 8-46. Ye explains that a workpiece 121 can be added to a chamber 110 for processing and then after removal of the workpiece 121, the dry cleaning process can be performed on the chamber 110. See Ye at col. 8, lines 18-45. However, Ye never describes or suggests that, after cleaning the chamber, a second etching on

the same workpiece 121 to form a second shape of a conductive film is performed. Rather, Ye's dry clean process is performed between discrete workpiece processing so that a new workpiece is inserted into the chamber after the dry cleaning. Ye explains that the invention "enables intermittent use of the cleaning steps in an ongoing plasma processing of semiconductor wafers without chamber downtime and significant loss of wafer production." See Ye at abstract.

Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Chow to provide for removal of BO_x adhered to an inside of a chamber after a first etching in the chamber and before a second etching in the chamber because Chow never suggests that BO_x would be adhered to an inside of the chamber during processing. Rather, in Chow, etchant residues to be removed include "polymeric organic compounds containing halogen, carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen." See Chow at col. 11, lines 13-47.

Accordingly, claims 1, 8, and 15 are allowable over any proper combination of Chow, Ye, Liu, and Wolf, and claims 6, 14, and 20 are allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1, 8, and 15 are allowable.

Claims 29-35 also have been rejected as being unpatentable over Chow in view of Ye, Liu, and Wolf. Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because, as discussed above, neither Chow, Ye, Liu, Wolf, nor any proper combination of the four describes or suggests performing a first etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, cleaning the chamber including generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue, and performing a second etching in the chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent claim 29. Accordingly, claim 29, and dependent claims 30-35 are allowable over any proper combination of Chow, Ye, Liu, and Wolf.

Claims 36-41 have been rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,352,081 (Lu) in view of Chow, Liu, and Wolf. Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because neither Lu, Chow, Liu, Wolf, nor any proper combination of the four describes or suggests performing a first etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, cleaning the

chamber including generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue, and performing a second etching in the chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent 36.

Lu relates to a dry cleaning method for removing deposited etch byproducts from surfaces of a semiconductor processing chamber after a copper etch process is performed in the chamber. See Lu at abstract. However, Lu never describes or suggests that the chamber is cleaned in part by removing BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber and that a second etching in the cleaned chamber is performed to form a second shape of a conductive film on which a first shape was already formed by performing a first etching in the chamber. Lu merely explains that the cleaning method can be "performed between wafer processing runs without opening the processing chamber, thereby minimizing potential contamination to the chamber as well as chamber downtime." See Lu at abstract.

Additionally, as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 8, Chow, Liu, and Wolf do not remedy the failure of Lu to describe or suggest this subject matter. Accordingly, claim 36 is allowable over any proper combination of Lu, Chow, Liu, and Wolf, and claims 37-41 are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 36 is allowable.

Claims 57-63 also have been rejected as being unpatentable over Chow in view of Lu, Liu, and Wolf. Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because, as similarly discussed above with respect to claim 36, neither Chow, Lu, Liu, Wolf, nor any proper combination of the four describes or suggests etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, generating plasma from a cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber, and etching in the cleaned chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent 57. Accordingly, claim 57 and dependent claims 58-63 are allowable over any proper combination of Chow, Lu, Liu, and Wolf.

Claims 64-70 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Lu in view of Chow, Liu, and Wolf. Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because, as similarly discussed above

with respect to claim 36, neither Lu, Chow, Liu, Wolf, nor any proper combination of the four describes or suggests etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, generating plasma from a cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber, and etching in the cleaned chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent 64. Accordingly, claim 64 and dependent claims 65-70 are allowable over any proper combination of Lu, Chow, Liu, and Wolf.

Claims 71-84 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Lu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,842,658 (Izawa), Chow, and Wolf. Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because neither Lu, Izawa, Chow, Wolf, nor any proper combination of the four describes or suggests etching a conductive film in a chamber to form a first shape of the conductive film, generating plasma from a cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber, and etching in the chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent claims 71 and 78.

In particular, Izawa does not remedy the failure of Lu, Chow and Wolf discussed above. Rather, in Izawa, a wafer is placed in a plasma processing chamber 1 to etch an antireflection coating on the wafer and then the wafer is moved to a gate processing chamber in which a gate electrode is etched on the wafer. See Izawa at col. 9, lines 13-35. Izawa never discloses performing a first etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, cleaning the chamber including removing BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber, and then performing a second etching in the cleaned chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film.

Accordingly, claims 71 and 78 are allowable over Lu in view of Izawa, Chow, and Wolf, as are dependent claims 72-77 and 79-84.

Claims 42, 49, 56, 62 and 69 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Lu in view of Izawa, Ye, and Wolf.

Claims 42, 62 and 69 depend, respectively, from claims 36, 57 and 64. As discussed above, neither Lu, Wolf, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests performing

a first etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue, and performing a second etching in the chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent claims 36, 57 and 64. Moreover, as also discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 8, Ye does not remedy the failure of Lu and Wolf to describe or suggest this subject matter, and as discussed above with respect to claims 71 and 78, Izawa also fails to do so. Accordingly, claims 36, 57 and 64 are allowable over any proper combination of Lu, Izawa, Ye, and Wolf, and claims 42, 62 and 69 are allowable for at least the reason that claims 36, 57 and 64 are allowable.

Claims 49 and 56 depend, respectively from claims 43 and 50. As discussed above, Wolf does not describe or suggest etching a conductive film in a chamber, cleaning the chamber including placing a second substrate (claim 43) or a dummy substrate (claim 50) in the chamber, and then etching the conductive film in the cleaned chamber, as recited in independent claims 43 and 50. Moreover, as also similarly discussed above, Lu, Izawa, and Ye do not remedy the failure of Wolf to describe or suggest this subject matter. Accordingly, claims 43 and 50 are allowable over any proper combination of Lu, Izawa, Ye, and Wolf, and claims 49 and 56 are allowable for at least the reason that claims 43 and 50 are allowable.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, and 11-13 have been rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0222306 (Hoefler) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0162827 (Yeh). Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because neither Hoefler, Yeh, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests performing a first etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, cleaning the chamber including generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue, and performing a second etching in the chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent claims 1 and 8.

In Hoefler, a semiconductor device 10 includes a substrate 12, and a semiconductor layer 18 over the substrate 12. See Hoefler at paragraphs 0014 and 0015. A conductive layer 34 is deposited by PVD on a gate dielectric 32 that is formed over the layer 18. See Hoefler at

paragraph 0021 and Fig. 4. The conductive layer 34 is etched to form a gate electrode 36 and control electrodes 38. See Hoefler at paragraph 0022 and Fig. 5. Hoefler never suggests forming a first shape of the conductive layer 34 by etching in a chamber, generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue, and then performing a second etching in the cleaned chamber to form a second shape of the conductive layer 34.

Apparently realizing these deficiencies, the Examiner cites Yeh and appears to argue that Yeh shows these features. In Yeh, a processing chamber is dry cleaned by introducing a first cleaning process gas and then a second cleaning process gas into the chamber to remove polymer built up on the interior surfaces of the chamber. See Yeh at abstract and paragraph 0023. However, Yeh never suggests performing a first etching in the chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue, and then performing a second etching in the chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 8 are allowable over any proper combination of Hoefler and Yeh, and claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, and 11-13 are allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 8 are allowable.

Claims 3, 6, 10, and 14 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Hoefler in view of Yeh, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0137352 (Nallan), and U.S. Patent No. 6,815,359 (Gabriel). These claims depend from claims 1 or 8, which were rejected as being unpatentable over Hoefler in view of Yeh. As discussed above, neither Hoefler, Yeh, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests performing a first etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue, and performing a second etching in the chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent claims 1 and 8. Nallan and Gabriel do not remedy the failure of these references to describe or suggest this subject matter.

Nallan relates to a method for providing a stable plasma for etching of films. See Nallan at paragraph 0002. However, Nallan never describes or suggests a first etching of a conductive film in a chamber, a cleaning of the chamber, and then a second etching of the conductive film in the chamber. Rather, Nallan mentions only etching of films and teaches away from cleaning of a chamber by explaining that the method offers the advantage that "the process chamber in which the etching is carried out remains particularly clean during the etch process." See Nallan at paragraphs 0002 and 0035.

Gabriel relates to a photolithography system in which a wafer 24 is etched while positioned within a chamber 12. See Gabriel at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 46 and col. 5, line 63 to col. 6, line 11. However, Gabriel never describes or suggests cleaning of the chamber 12 and then performing a second etching of the wafer 24 in the chamber 12 after the cleaning.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 8 are allowable over any proper combination of Hoefler, Yeh, Nallan, and Gabriel, and claims 3, 6, 10, and 14 are allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 8 are allowable.

Claims 15-28 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Hoefler in view of Yeh and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0171085 (Suzawa). Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because neither Hoefler, Yeh, Suzawa, nor any proper combination of the three describes or suggests performing a first etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, cleaning the chamber including placing a second substrate in the chamber, and then performing a second etching in the cleaned chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent claims 15 and 22.

As discussed above, Hoefler's conductive layer 34 is etched to form the gate electrode 36 and the control electrodes 38. See Hoefler at paragraph 0022 and Fig. 5. But, Hoefler never describes or suggests forming a first shape of the conductive layer 34 by etching in a chamber, cleaning the chamber, and then performing a second etching in the cleaned chamber to form a second shape of the conductive layer 34. As also discussed above, in Yeh, the processing chamber is dry cleaned, but Yeh never describes or suggests performing a first etching in the

chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, cleaning the chamber, and then performing a second etching in the chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film.

Suzawa does not remedy the failure of these references to describe or suggest this subject matter. In Suzawa, a first amorphous semiconductor film 1001 is etched using an etching gas to form source and drain electrodes. See Suzawa at abstract. However, Suzawa never describes or suggests cleaning a chamber in which the semiconductor film 1001 was etched, and then performing a second etching in the cleaned chamber to form a second shape of the semiconductor film 1001.

Accordingly, for these reasons, claims 15 and 22 are allowable over any proper combination of Hoefler, Yeh, and Suzawa, and claims 16-21 and 23-28 are allowable for at least the reasons that claims 15 and 22 are allowable.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 29, 30, 32, 50, and 51 have been rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0048829 (Yamazaki) in view of Yeh.

With respect to claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 29, 30, and 32, applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because neither Yamazaki, Yeh, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests performing a first etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue, and performing a second etching in the chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent claims 1, 8, and 29.

In Yamazaki, a first conductive film 103 and a second conductive film 104 are formed over an insulation film 102, and the conductive films 103, 104 are subsequently etched. See Yamazaki at paragraphs 0011, 0012, and 0016. However, Yamazaki never describes or suggests that, after etching the conductive film 103 or 104, a chamber is cleaned to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber, and performing a second etching in the cleaned chamber.

Yeh does not remedy the failure of Yamazaki to describe or suggest this subject matter. As discussed above, in Yeh, a processing chamber is dry cleaned by introducing a first cleaning process gas and then a second cleaning process gas into the chamber to remove polymer built up

on the interior surfaces of the chamber. See Yeh at abstract and paragraph 0023. However, Yeh never suggests performing a first etching in the chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue, and then performing a second etching in the cleaned chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film.

Accordingly, claims 1, 8, and 29, and dependent claims 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 29, 30, and 32 are allowable over any proper combination of Yamazaki and Yeh.

With respect to claims 50 and 51, applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because, as similarly discussed above, neither Yamazaki, Yeh, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests etching a conductive film in a chamber, cleaning the chamber including placing a dummy substrate in the chamber, and then etching the conductive film in the cleaned chamber, as recited in independent claim 50. Accordingly, claim 50 and dependent claim 51 are allowable over any proper combination of Yamazaki and Yeh.

Claims 4, 13, and 34 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Yeh and U.S. Patent No. 6,221,200 (Saito). Claims 4, 13, and 34 depend, respectively, from claims 1, 8, and 29, which were rejected as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Yeh. As discussed above, neither Yamazaki, Yeh, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests performing a first etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, cleaning the chamber including generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue, and performing a second etching in the cleaned chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent claims 1, 8, and 29.

Saito does not remedy the failure of these references to describe or suggest this subject matter. In Saito, a semiconductor wafer dummy is fixed in a plasma etching chamber to remove a deposited silicon by etching. See Saito at col. 3, lines 20-49. However, Saito never describes or suggests a first etching is performed in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, cleaning the chamber including generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue, and then performing a second etching in the cleaned

chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film. Accordingly, claims 1, 8, and 29 are allowable over any proper combination of Yamazaki, Yeh, and Saito, and claims 4, 13, and 34 are allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1, 8, and 29 are allowable.

Claims 3, 6, 10, 14, 31, 33, 35-49, and 52-84 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Yeh, Nallan, and Gabriel.

Claims 3, 6, 10, 14, 31, 33, and 35 depend from claims 1, 8, or 29, which were rejected as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Yeh. As discussed above, neither Yamazaki, Yeh, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests performing a first etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, cleaning the chamber including generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue, and performing a second etching in the cleaned chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent claims 1, 8, and 29. As also discussed above, Nallan and Gabriel, alone or in combination, do not remedy the failure of Yamazaki and Yeh to describe or suggest this subject matter. Accordingly, claims 1, 8, and 29 are allowable over any proper combination of Yamazaki, Yeh, Nallan, and Gabriel, and claims 3, 6, 10, 14, 31, 33, and 35 are allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1, 8, and 29 are allowable.

With respect to claims 36-42 and 57-84, applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because, as discussed above, neither Yamazaki, Yeh, Nallan, Gabriel, nor any proper combination of the four describes or suggests performing a first etching in a chamber to form a first shape of a conductive film, generating plasma from the cleaning gas to remove BO_x adhered to an inside of the chamber as a residue, and performing a second etching in the chamber to form a second shape of the conductive film, as recited in independent claims 36, 57, 64, 71, and 78. Accordingly, claims 36, 57, 64, 71, and 78, and dependent claims 37-42, 58-63, 65-70, 72-77, and 79-84, are allowable over any proper combination of Yamazaki, Yeh, Nallan, and Gabriel.

With respect to claims 43-56, applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because, as similarly discussed above, neither Yamazaki, Yeh, Nallan, Gabriel, nor any proper combination of the four describes or suggests etching a conductive film in a chamber, cleaning the chamber

including placing a second substrate (claim 43) or a dummy substrate (claim 50) in the chamber, and then etching the conductive film in the cleaned chamber, as recited in independent claims 43 and 50. Accordingly, claims 43 and 50, and dependent claims 44-49 and 51-56, are allowable over any proper combination of Yamazaki, Yeh, Nallan, and Gabriel.

Conclusion

In conclusion, applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. The fee in the amount of $120 in payment of the one-month extension of time is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 31, 2007

/Diana DiBerardino/
Diana DiBerardino
Reg. No. 45,653

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331